

Indoor Air-quality Investigation in Code for Sustainable Homes and Passivhaus Dwellings: A Case Study

Grainne McGill^a, Lukumon O. Oyedele^b, Greg Keeffe^a

^aSchool of Planning, Architecture and Civil Engineering, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, United Kingdom

^bUniversity of West of England, Bristol, Bristol Enterprise, Research and Innovation Centre (BERIC), FBL, Frenchay Campus, Bristol, United Kingdom

Abstract

Purpose - Energy efficient building design strategies are growing in popularity, promoted through increased awareness of climate change, rising energy prices, global consciousness and a demand for energy security. To aid this design process, assessment tools such as Code for Sustainable Homes (CSHs) and Passivhaus were introduced in the UK. However, it is suggested that these tools prioritise energy efficiency over occupant health through a fundamental lack of attention to indoor air quality (IAQ). This paper aims to investigate IAQ in selected dwellings built using CSHs level 6, level 3 and Passivhaus homes in the UK.

Design/Methodology/Approach – Using a case study approach, the investigation consisted of indoor air quality measurements during summer and winter months, occupant diaries and occupant interviews.

Findings – The results from the IAQ measurements show the recommended maximum level of 1000 ppm was breached in all three Code 6 and two Code 3 homes, with levels slightly below this limit in the two Passivhaus homes. Measurements found high levels of formaldehyde, carbon dioxide, and low levels of relative humidity.

Practical Implications – There is a need for the adequate consideration of IAQ in sustainable assessment methods, including the use of mandatory credits to ensure occupant health is not disregarded in the drive towards zero carbon.

Originality/Value – These results can be used to recognize areas of improvement in the Code for Sustainable Homes and Passivhaus standard, and the design of energy efficient homes in general. Research of this nature is essential to ensure occupant health is not sacrificed through the drive towards zero carbon.

Keywords: Code for sustainable homes, Indoor air quality, Passivhaus, Social housing, Zero Carbon, Energy efficiency

Introduction

Climate change is considered to be one of the most important challenges of the 21st century (Smith 2005). In response, a global effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions has begun. The UK government is addressing this challenge through the Climate Change Act (2008), which sets a legally binding target of an 80% reduction of carbon dioxide emissions from 1990's figure by 2050 (HM Government 2008). The built environment is thought to contribute to approximately 25-40% of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions in developed countries (de Wilde and Coley 2012), thus a major reform of the construction industry is needed.

Recent research however suggests building design strategies implemented to mitigate the effect of climate change have the potential to cause significant unintended consequences (Davies and Oreszczyn 2012). For instance, concerns with overheating of the interior environment, indoor air quality (IAQ) problems and dependence of Mechanical Ventilation systems have been expressed (Corsi, 2011). To aid the transition to a more sustainable built environment, assessment methods have been devised to measure the environmental performance of building projects. The ability however of these schemes to adequately address occupant health and wellbeing is questionable. For instance, the predominant emphasis on energy efficiency in buildings results in a highly subjective definition of sustainability, where trade-offs between building energy conservation and IAQ are subsequently disregarded. As explained by Dols, Persily and Nabinger (1996, 139), 'rating systems that have been developed to assess the "greenness" of a building are based largely on design features and are not particularly specific with respect to indoor air quality.'

In the UK, the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSHs) was devised to enable a step change towards sustainable residential design practices (DCLG 2006). It considers a more holistic approach to sustainable assessment as it encompasses a range of categories, including health and wellbeing. It is clear however that there is a fundamental lack of criteria relating to the achievement of good IAQ in the CSHs rating scheme. For example, the section on 'health and wellbeing' includes day-lighting, sound insulation, private space and lifetime homes, however makes no reference to IAQ. Similarly, the German Passivhaus standard

(which is based on precise space heating and energy criteria), does not provide adequate attention to IAQ. Levin (2005, 1138) states that, 'the integration of IAQ concerns in so-called "sustainable" designs suffers from a lack of comprehensive assessment methods for building environmental performance and a lack of integration of the knowledge developed in the indoor air sciences during the past three decades.' Thus, greater collaboration between the IEQ research community and green building councils is needed to increase the awareness of interior environmental quality (IEQ) and the effectiveness of sustainable assessment schemes in ensuring these needs are met in practice (Clausen et al. 2011).

It is on these bases that the study emerges, with the following aims:

- (i) To investigate and compare the IAQ of new energy efficient social homes designed to specific assessment tools (CSHs and Passivhaus),
- (ii) To investigate occupants' perception of IAQ and thermal comfort, occupant behaviour and occupant reported health, and
- (iii) To evaluate the success of these assessment tools at achieving good IAQ.

The study was conducted through a case study investigation consisting of air quality monitoring, building surveys, guided occupant interviews and occupant diaries.

IAQ and energy efficient design strategies

Prominent features of sustainable building designs make consideration of IAQ particularly important. Increased airtightness, the reduction of ventilation rates, dependence on mechanical ventilation systems and the use of new construction techniques and materials all pose a significant threat to the quality of indoor air. These potential trade-offs are discussed below.

Increased Airtightness

The tightening of building envelopes reduces the amount of natural infiltration, which reduces contaminant dilution with outside air if ventilation rates are not subsequently increased. IAQ problems, Sick Building Syndrome (SBS) symptoms (also known as tight

building syndrome) and Multiple Chemical Sensitivity (MCS) have all been associated with the extensive construction of airtight buildings in response to the energy crisis (Mendell and Fine 1994; Letz 1990; Lyles et al. 1991; Wasley 2000).

As homes become more airtight, less dependence can be placed on air permeability to achieve adequate ventilation (Bone et al. 2010). Despite the fact that infiltration is not considered a good method of ventilation (Persily and Emmerich 2010), inattentive tightening of building envelopes has the potential to increase exposure to airborne pollutants, combustion gases (Richardson and Eick 2006), indoor humidity and mould growth. Furthermore, the likelihood of airborne spread of infections may increase in 'tighter' building designs (Schenck et al. 2010). In homes of immune-suppressed individuals, young children and/or the elderly, this may be of significant concern.

Reduction of Ventilation Rates

Emphasis on building energy conservation has resulted in a reduction of ventilation rates in correlation with higher levels of airtightness. However, as explained by Yu and Kim (2012, 6), 'the highly air-tight buildings with low ventilation particularly in a warm interior environment could encourage development of moisture risk, which would lead to proliferation of moulds.' This is supported by Offermann (2010), who explains the combination of airtight homes and the lack of window opening results in significantly low air change rates, thus elevating indoor air contaminants.

The reduction of ventilation rates in homes has the potential to significantly affect occupant health and wellbeing. For instance, a study by Sundell et al. (2011), found ventilation rates above 0.5 air changes per hour (ach) in the home environment were associated with a lower risk of allergic manifestations in children. Similarly, Bornehag et al. (2005) conducted a study of 390 Swedish homes and found that lower ventilation rates were associated with the prevalence of rhinitis, wheezing and/or eczema. Furthermore, this study found 80% of single family homes investigated did not meet the minimum recommended ventilation rate of 0.5 ach. This is supported by a study of ventilation rates in European homes which found poor ventilation in practice (below 0.5 ach) (Dimitroulopoulou 2012). However, as pointed out by

Dimitroupoulou (2012), this widely used recommended minimum ventilation rate of 0.5 ach is not based on health criteria. For instance, significantly higher air changes (0.8 ach) may be needed to control the proliferation of house dust mites (Ridley et al. 2006; Ucci et al. 2004).

Dependence on Mechanical Ventilation Systems

The increasing use of mechanical ventilation systems in housing signifies a step-change in the UK construction sector. Attributable to improvements in technology, Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) systems are now practically standard in new, more energy efficient UK homes (NHBC 2009). These systems have been proven to achieve a reduction of energy consumption (Mardiana-Idayu and Riffat 2012), improved IAQ (Mlecnik et al. 2012), reduction of house dust mites (Eick and Richardson 2011) and improved thermal comfort (Schnieders and Hermelink 2006). However recent research has also highlighted numerous problems with MVHR, such as inadequate specification, poor installation and performance, incorrect commissioning, lack of maintenance, thermal comfort complaints, noise, occupant interference, and a lack of knowledge and awareness of the systems.

‘Insert Table 1 here’

These deficiencies of MVHR systems are now widespread in the construction industry, particularly in the UK where mechanical ventilation in the residential sector is still relatively immature. As suggested by Turner, Logue and Wray (2013, 194), ‘such deficiencies occur because systems are field assembled (usually without design specifications), there is no consistent process to identify and correct problems, and the value of such activities in terms of reducing energy use and improving IAQ is unknown.’ Maintenance of mechanical ventilation systems in residential environments is also of significant concern. As suggested by Crump, Dengel, and Swainson (2009), the market for filter replacements in the UK remains largely unsaturated with limited options for consumers, suggesting maintenance of ventilation systems is significantly lacking.

New construction techniques and materials

The utilisation of new construction methods and building materials in the residential sector poses significant risk to occupant health through potential unintended consequences on the quality of the indoor air. As explained by Corsi (2011, 440), 'new green and sustainable materials, from flooring to coatings and insulation, are being introduced at a rate that exceeds our current ability to properly evaluate them, their long term performance in buildings and their effects on building occupants.' Efforts to classify, regulate and eliminate the use of toxic materials however are hindered through variances in individual susceptibility, complex interactions between contaminants and the unknown effect of variations in interior environmental conditions (Persily and Emmerich 2010; Dols, Persilly, and Nabinger 1996).

In addition, the transition from solid, site built construction to more lightweight, pre-fabricated systems not only reduces the sink area for pollutant absorption, but also considerably increases interior contaminant concentrations, through the creation of impervious surfaces (Spengler and Chen 2000). Energy efficient design strategies which increase interior temperatures further exacerbate the degradation of IAQ through increasing vapour pressures which increase the emission of VOCs (Levin 1995). In addition, the increased use of recycled materials (Crump 2011), wood-based composites and/or synthetic materials (Lee et al. 2012) in modern construction processes have increased off-gassing of toxic chemicals into the interior environment.

Based on the existing literature, lessons are gradually being learned about the potential problems in mechanically ventilated, energy efficient homes and how to overcome these. As suggested by Taylor and Morgan (2011), latest evidence raises concerns for the entire UK home building industry, since many unmonitored energy efficient homes may have IAQ and/or ventilation problems that subsequently go undiagnosed. Thus there exists a significant need for IAQ research and post occupancy studies in UK energy efficient homes, including the monitoring and evaluation of MVHR systems in a residential setting (Sullivan et al. 2013, 2012; Crump, Dengel, and Swainson 2009). The fundamental influence of human behaviour has been largely neglected in IAQ research to date, yet inhabitants play an active

role in determining the quality of indoor air. The case study method provided the opportunity to investigate IAQ in energy efficient homes, in a real life, multivariate context.

Methodology

Household Characteristics

This study investigated the IAQ in three zero carbon homes designed to meet Code for Sustainable Homes (CSHs) Level 6, two Passivhaus homes and two CSHs Level 3 homes. The homes are all new-build; construction work was completed between October 2012 and January 2013. Code level 6 requires net-zero carbon dioxide emissions from all home energy use, including heating, lighting, hot water, and appliances (DCLG 2006). The Passivhaus standard requires adherence to specific criteria, most notably an annual primary energy demand of $\leq 120 \text{ kWh/m}^2$, airtightness of $\leq 0.6 \text{ ach-1}$, an annual heating requirement of $\leq 15 \text{ kWh/m}^2$ and a peak space heating load of 10 W/m^2 .

'Insert Table 2 here'

The case study dwellings are all social rented properties located in England within the same development, with similar orientation. All dwellings are three storey, cavity wall (Passivhaus and Code 6) or timber frame construction (Code 3) with brick outer leaf; either semi-detached or mid terraced with a total floor area between $100\text{-}120 \text{ m}^2$. The Passivhaus and Code 6 properties incorporate a range of energy efficient design strategies, including the use of triple glazing (low E), increased airtightness, MVHR, A+ rated appliances and low flow rate sanitary ware. The Code 3 dwellings have double glazed windows (low E) and utilise mechanical extract ventilation with trickle vents.

The field work consisted of physical IAQ measurements with simultaneous measurements of outside conditions, occupant interviews, analysis of construction drawings, building survey and occupant diaries during the measurement period. The occupant interviews were conducted to gain information on perception of IAQ and thermal comfort, occupant activities, presence of Building Related Illnesses (BRI) or Sick Building Syndrome symptoms

(SBS) and occupant behaviour. The building survey gained information on building conditions and was conducted on the day of the measurements. The occupant diary gained information on occupancy rates and occupant activities during the measurement period.

Physical Indoor Air Quality Measurements

The physical IAQ measurements included real-time monitoring over a 24 hour period (typical weekday) in each home on subsequent days in the main living room, bedroom and outside. Measurements were conducted during the summer months, with winter measurements also conducted in available homes (as only a number of homes were occupied at this time). Temperature, relative humidity, and carbon dioxide were monitored in the living room with an Extech IAQ datalogger (Easyview EA80- RH resolution 0.1%, accuracy $\pm 3\text{-}5\%$, temperature resolution 0.1°C , accuracy $\pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$, carbon dioxide resolution 1ppm, accuracy $\pm 3\%$ or $\pm 50\text{ppm}$) and in the bedroom and outside with Wohler CO₂ datalogger (CDL 210- RH resolution 0.1%, accuracy $\pm 3\text{-}5\%$, temperature resolution 0.1°C , accuracy $\pm 0.6^\circ\text{C}$, carbon dioxide resolution 1ppm, accuracy $\pm 5\%$ or $\pm 50\text{ppm}$). Formaldehyde measurements were conducted with a HalTech (HAL-HFX205- resolution 0.01ppm, accuracy $\pm 2\%$) handheld formaldehyde meter which utilises electro-chemical sensing technology.

Equipment was set up at least 1m from walls and 1.2m above finished floor level (in correspondence with ISO:16000.1). Care however was taken to place equipment in a convenient location given the nature of the measurements; for instance it was important to ensure that the normal use of the room was not affected. Outside measurements were taken with a weather station (Watson W-8681 Solar weather station), and data was also obtained from a nearby monitoring centre.

Occupant Interviews, Observations and Diary

Structured occupant interviews were conducted through the use of specific questionnaires: one for each occupant, one for each household and one for each child (answered by parent/guardian on behalf of the child) and a building survey form. This format provided the opportunity for further discussion and enabled the utilisation of open ended questions and

prompts for explanations or comments to support the quantitative data. Occupants were also asked to demonstrate knowledge of the MVHR system through practical exercises observed by the researcher (for example, locating controls, changing settings etc.). Validated procedures were followed (Berry et al. 1996; Raw et al. 1995; 1996; Burge, Robertson, and Hedge 1993; 1990) for acquisition of data on perception of IAQ and thermal comfort, and the presence of BRI and SBS symptoms. A dictaphone was used to record the interview when possible.

The occupant diary consisted of a brief record sheet (single A4 page for each day of measurements), which was devised to reduce the burden on occupants and increase the response rate. The diary recorded information for each hour of the measurement period, including average hourly occupancy rates, heating patterns, window/door opening behaviour, cooking, cleaning, smoking (indoors), use of air-polluting products (such as cleaning products, candles, incense) and use of boost mode in MVHR (if applicable). There was also a section at the bottom of the occupant diary which provided the opportunity to record any other activities which may have affected the measurement results.

Results

Physical Measurements

Carbon Dioxide- Living Room

Summer carbon dioxide levels in the living room over the 24 hour monitoring period peaked above the recommended maximum level of 1000 ppm (EPA and NIOSH, 1991) in all Code level 6 and Code level 3 homes. In comparison, the two Passivhaus homes peaked at 958 ppm and 976 ppm respectfully (as illustrated in Table 4). Two homes (C6 No.2 and C3 No.2) peaked above 2000 ppm, suggesting unacceptable levels of carbon dioxide with regard to health and hygiene (German Working Group 2008).

'Insert Table 3 here'

As illustrated in Figure 1, carbon dioxide levels peaked above 2000 ppm for only a short period of time, which is most likely a result of an occupants breathing close to the sensor. Carbon dioxide levels correlated with recorded average hourly occupancy, as measured through the occupancy diary.

‘Insert Figure 1 here’

During the winter months, one Code 3 home (C3 No.1) and two Code 6 homes (C6 No.1 and C6 No.2) were available to monitor. During the 24 hour monitoring period, the peak levels of carbon dioxide were above the recommended guideline value of 1000 ppm in all case study dwellings (C6 No.1: 1189ppm; C6 No.2: 2416ppm; C3: No.1: 1431ppm), with mean living room occupancy ranging from 1.18-1.73 people. Average living room carbon dioxide levels however were all below 1,000ppm.

Carbon Dioxide: Bedroom Night Time Levels

Summer carbon dioxide levels were recorded in the main bedroom over the 24 hour monitoring period. All occupants stated that the bedroom windows were closed during this time. The results in Table 4 present the carbon dioxide levels from the reported time the occupants went to bed, until the reported time they got up. In the two kids bedrooms measured (C6 No.2 and Pa No.2); the levels of carbon dioxide were significantly low. However in four out of the five main bedrooms measured, carbon dioxide levels peaked above 1000 ppm, with only the Passivhaus dwelling (Pa No.1) remaining below this guideline value. Furthermore, in the main bedroom of one Code 6 (C6 No.1) and one Code 3 home (C3 No.1), the average carbon dioxide value was also above 1000 ppm.

‘Insert Table 4 here’

Relative Humidity: Living room

As presented in Table 5, summer relative humidity levels in only one home peaked slightly above 60% (C3 No.1), with all average values below 60%. However, in one of the Passivhaus dwellings (Pa No.1), humidity levels dropped below 30% (26.4%), which may result in comfort complaints, such as the perception of 'dry air', eye irritation and/or upper airway irritation (Wolkoff et al. 2005; Wolkoff and Kjærgaard 2007). During the winter, relative humidity levels in the living room were below 60% in all homes. However, in two homes, minimum values were recorded below 30% (C6 No.1: 26.7%; C3 No.1: 24.8%). Average living room humidity levels during the winter monitoring period were as follows: C6 No.1: 44.8%; C6 No.2: 38.9%; C3 No.1: 32.1%.

'Insert Table 5 here'

Relative Humidity: Bedroom

Relative humidity levels above 60% provide sufficient conditions for mould growth; however above 50% provides sufficient conditions for the proliferation of house dust mite (HDM) (Arlian, Neal, and Vyszynski-Moher 1999; Arundel et al. 1986). Summer relative humidity levels peaked above 50% in five out of seven bedrooms monitored, with average values above 50% in three. Two homes recorded maximum relative humidity values $\geq 60\%$ (C6 No.1; C3 No.2). There was no significant difference between the three house types monitored, or the use of MVHR.

'Insert Table 6 here'

Temperature: Living Room, Bedroom and Outside

Average temperatures during winter in C6 No.1 and C3 No.1 were below 18°C (C6 No.1: 17.7°C; C3 No.1: 17.5°C); however outside average temperatures were close to freezing during these measurement periods. Peak temperatures ranged from 21.2- 24.7°C in the measured dwellings. Outside conditions varied during the summer measurement period. In dwelling

C6 No.3, summer living room temperatures reached 28.2°C with an average temperature of 26.2°C, suggesting significant problems with overheating. During the monitoring period of C6 No.3, outside temperatures peaked at 28.4°C, however average temperatures were significantly lower at 18.3°C. There was no significant difference between the three house types.

‘Insert Table 7 here’

Formaldehyde: Living Room

Summer formaldehyde levels in all dwellings peaked above the World Health Organisation’s (2000) recommended maximum 30 minute time weighted average (TWA) of 0.08 ppm (0.01 mg/m³). Furthermore, two Code 6 homes recorded 24 hour average levels above this guideline value. Both Passivhaus homes and Code 3 homes recorded average values below 0.08 ppm. Peak formaldehyde levels were significantly high in the majority of the case study homes, with levels reaching over tenfold the guideline value in three homes (C3 No.1, Pa No.2, C6 No.2), which suggests intermittent sources. Furthermore, as these dwellings were new build and had only been occupied for a number of months, off-gassing from building materials is likely and therefore may have contributed to the high average levels.

‘Insert Table 8 here’

‘Insert Table 9 here’

Results from the occupant diaries (presented in Table 9) show that occupant(s) of one Code 6 home (C6 No.2) and the two Code 3 homes smoked indoors during the measurement period. This may explain the significantly high peak levels of formaldehyde in C6 No.2 (1.50 ppm) and C3 No.1 (2.53 ppm). In C6 No.1 however, maximum levels of formaldehyde remained reasonably low (0.12 ppm) in comparison. This may be due to a number of factors, such as distance from the monitoring equipment or duration of smoking, which was not recorded in the occupant diary. Also important to note is that during the monitoring

period occupants of all homes used some form of air freshener indoors. This may have significantly contributed to the levels of formaldehyde recorded, particularly if the air freshener was used close to the monitoring equipment.

‘Insert Figure 2 here’

All Passivhaus dwellings, Code 3 dwellings and one Code 6 dwelling (C6 No.2) had one occupant who smoked. Of these, the Code 6 household and the two Code 3 households monitored stated that cigarettes are smoked in the home. Furthermore, six out of seven households used air-fresheners, scented candles or incense on a daily basis indoors, with the other household stating they used them 1-2 times a week (C6 No.3). This raises the question of whether or not these homes require a certain degree of lifestyle adjustment to ensure occupant health and wellbeing is not at risk in more energy efficient dwellings.

‘Insert Figure 3 here’

Occupant Interviews

Ventilation strategies- Natural

Occupants of the case study dwellings were asked how often the windows were opened during the summer months. As illustrated in Figure 3, occupants of the Passivhaus homes opened the windows most often, suggesting the presence of MVHR in the homes did not reduce the need to open the windows. In the two Code 3 dwellings, both households were aware of the presence of trickle vents, however in C3 No.1 occupants stated they are never used for background ventilation. In C3 No.2, occupants stated trickle vents were constantly used for background ventilation, however the building survey on the day of the measurements identified that all the trickle vents were closed, similar to C3 No.1. Occupants of the Code 6 and Passivhaus dwellings were asked their preferred strategy for ventilation: either natural ventilation (opening windows or doors) or technological (use of mechanical ventilation system). In the Code 6 homes, natural ventilation was the preferred strategy apart from one occupant in C6 No.1 who stated they preferred natural ventilation during

the summer months and mechanical ventilation in winter. They explained: *“if it is summer, I will open the windows, but in the winter months, if you open the windows you will lose the heat, so it depends”*. In the Passivhaus dwellings, all occupants stated they preferred natural ventilation.

Interference with the MVHR System

Findings suggest a significant problem of occupant interference with the mechanical ventilation system. Out of the three Code 6 households interviewed, two (C6 No.2 and C6 No.3) had turned the MVHR system off completely. During the interview process, an occupant from C6 No.2 explained that there was an early fault with the system (a flashing red light) so they turned it off. However, they further stated, *“the kids have turned it off and it just has not been back on, (...) we just don’t use it”*. In dwelling C6 No.3, at the initial interview occupants stated that they did not have any problems with the system; however during the building survey they mentioned they had turned the ventilation system off as it was making a loud noise.

In the other Code 6 home (C6 No.1), although the system had not been turned off, the building survey revealed that the supply/extract vents had been tightened in the living room, main bathroom, and two out of the three bedrooms, so that they were effectively closed. The occupant explained they had tightened the vents as they were having issues with the noise of the machine and thermal comfort as *“the vents were blowing out cold air”*. In comparison, the MVHR in the two Passivhaus dwellings had not been interfered with, however it should be noted that in these homes the MVHR units were located in a locked cupboard which occupants did not have access to.

Awareness and Use of the Boost Mode Function

All occupants of the Code 6 and Passivhaus homes were asked if there was a boost mode function on the MVHR system, and if so, how often it was used. In the Code 6 homes, two out of three households (C6 No.2 and C6 No.3) stated that they were ‘not sure’ if there was a boost mode function, despite numerous boost mode switches clearly visible in the

landings of all three homes. In C6 No.1, occupants stated that there was a boost mode function and they used it frequently, however mentioned issues with the noise of the fan boost, particularly as the ventilation unit was located beside the main bedroom. In the two Passivhaus dwellings, both households were aware of the boost mode function, however they stated it was used rarely (Pa No.1) or occasionally when cooking (Pa No.2).

Over-heating

All case study dwellings were asked if they had ever experienced any problems with over-heating in the home. Out of the three Code 6 dwellings, one household answered yes explaining *“if the heating is on too much downstairs all the heat goes upstairs”*. Furthermore one out of the two Passivhaus dwellings investigated stated yes explaining, *“it gets really hot during the night”*. In comparison, all Code 3 households stated no.

Knowledge of the ventilation system

Households with MVHR were asked a variety of questions in order to identify their knowledge of the system operation. For example, occupants were asked if they knew what setting the ventilation system was at and to demonstrate how to change the settings; all of which replied no or not sure. Control panels were not made available to the occupants in the Code 6 or Passivhaus dwellings. The occupants of the Passivhaus homes explained the units were located in a locked cupboard; therefore they did not have access to the controls. All households interviewed stated that they did not know how to change the filters in the MVHR systems. Furthermore, general questions on whether it was possible to adjust the temperature of the incoming air and if there was a by-pass mode for summer months were answered with ‘not sure’ by all households.

Indoor Air Quality Perception

Occupants were asked to rate the IAQ of the homes during both summer and winter months, based on standard rating scales. As illustrated in Table 10, the average scores in C6

No.2 for the 'dry-humid' scale during winter was 6, suggesting problems with indoor humidity. However, overall satisfaction scores during both summer and winter in Code 6 homes do not suggest any significant problems with the perception of IAQ.

In the Passivhaus homes during the winter months, overall satisfaction of the IAQ was good, with scores of 1 and 1.5. However, during the summer months, results suggest issues with humidity (dry-humid scale score= 5-6) in both households. Furthermore, in Pa No.2, the average score for the 'fresh-stuffy' rating scale was 6, suggesting ventilation problems. The overall satisfaction score in this home was 4, suggesting IAQ issues.

Finally, in one of the Code 3 homes (C3 No.1), perception of draughts was identified (too still-too draughty rating scale score of 5) during both summer and winter months; which is likely to be the cause of the low satisfaction score (satisfactory overall-unsatisfactory overall rating scale score of 5). No significant IAQ issues were identified in the other Code 3 home (C3 No.2).

'Insert Table 10 here'

Thermal Comfort Perception

In the Code 6 dwellings, overall thermal comfort satisfaction was very good during both summer and winter months, with average scores of 1 for all three households. However in the Passivhaus dwellings, results suggest issues with thermal comfort during the summer months, with overall satisfaction scores of 3-3.5. Similarly, average scores for the rating scale comfortable (1) - uncomfortable (7) during summer months were 5.5 and 3.5. Average scores of 1.5 and 3 were reported for the too hot (1) - too cold (7) rating scale, suggesting problems with overheating. In the Code 3 dwellings, results varied significantly. One household reported low levels of satisfaction during both summer and winter months, with average scores of 7 for the too hot (1) - too cold (7) scale during winter; suggesting significant issues with thermal comfort. In the other household, no issues were identified.

‘Insert Table 11 here’

Sick Building Syndrome Symptoms

As illustrated in Table 12, Sick Building Syndrome (SBS) symptoms were reported in the case study buildings; however this is not of significant concern considering the low prevalence. The symptoms were identified if occupants stated they experienced more than one episode of the symptom and it was better at times away from the home. In some cases, occupants stated that they were not sure if the symptom was better since they spent the majority of time at home; in this case, the symptom was still included. As defined by Raw (1995), BSI₅ includes the following symptoms: dryness of the eyes, blocked or stuffy nose, dry throat, lethargy and/or tiredness and headache. BSI₈ includes these five symptoms and the following: dry, itchy or irritated skin, runny nose, and itchy or watery eyes.

‘Insert Table 12 here’

Discussion

The results from the IAQ measurements show the recommended maximum level of 1000 ppm was breached in all three Code 6 and two Code 3 homes, with levels slightly below this limit in the two Passivhaus homes. During the building survey, it was identified that trickle vents in both Code 3 homes were closed, which may significantly diminish the ability of these homes to provide adequate ventilation. Furthermore, during the occupant interviews and observations, the MVHR system in two of the Code 6 homes (C6 No.2; C6 No.3) was turned off completely. The supply and extract vents in the other Code 6 home (C6 No.1) had been effectively closed. These results suggest occupant awareness of the importance of home ventilation is required, in addition to improvements in the commissioning process to ensure vents are adequately locked in place to limit occupant interference. Further research is required to investigate thermal comfort complaints associated with the MVHR systems, including actual in-built efficiency of the heat recovery aspect. Occupant control is a

significant issue in the application of MVHR in social housing. On one hand, if occupants are given too much control (e.g. in the Code 6 dwellings), MVHR systems may be interfered with or turned off altogether. However, if no control is given (e.g. the Passivhaus dwellings), this raises significant concerns regarding maintenance issues and the ability to appropriately adjust the system for seasonal variations (e.g. summer by-pass mode), occupancy levels and/or occupant activities. Furthermore, problems with the MVHR may go unnoticed in the future.

Strategies for the implementation of mechanical ventilation with heat recovery systems in social housing however should consider variation of user groups, such as older people, families and/or socio-economically-disadvantaged. For example, full control may not be appropriate or desired for older people. In this case, sensors may be more suitable to adequately regulate the system according to requirements, with regular maintenance conducted by the housing association or associated body. A major concern for socio-economically disadvantaged occupants is the cost associated with running the systems, which can lead to occupants turning off the system altogether. It is important therefore to ensure systems cannot be easily disconnected and the heat recovery strategy is fully explained. For example, the results from the case study investigation looking at family user groups suggest inadequate use of purge ventilation, which may significantly increase the concentration of contaminants and/or moisture indoors. It may be more beneficial to provide automatic boost mode functions linked with particular activities, for example turning on the cooker in the kitchen and/or the shower in the bathroom. These strategies may help to improve the removal of pollutants and excess moisture in energy efficient social housing.

Overheating was reported in one Code 6 home and one Passivhaus home, which was supported by the results of the summer physical measurements. Apprehensions have been expressed regarding the ability of mechanical ventilation systems in achieving adequate purge ventilation for effective cooling, suggesting the need for incorporation of additional passive design strategies in energy efficient homes (Bone et al. 2010). This should be

incorporated effectively in the sustainable assessment methods in order to ensure IAQ and thermal comforts are not sacrificed in the drive towards energy efficiency.

Occupant knowledge of the ventilation system observed through the physical exercise was significantly poor. For example, all households stated that they did not know how to change the settings or the filters in the MVHR systems. As these homes are rented properties, this is not of particular concern as the housing association is likely to deal with maintenance, however it does mean occupants are relying on the housing association to maintain the system effectively. This could cause significant problems in the future, especially where systems are inaccessible thus occupants may not be aware of maintenance and/or servicing requirements. Occupants were asked the frequency of various activities carried out in the home, including the use of air polluting products. The results suggest important sources of contaminants in the home environment (such as use of air fresheners or smoking), which are rarely considered during the design process. This raises concern of the suitability of airtight, mechanically ventilated dwellings for particular occupants and/or activities, and whether or not these homes require a certain lifestyle adjustment. Thus further consideration of occupant related sources of pollutants indoors is required in the design of energy efficient homes, including the need to educate and inform residents on the importance of minimising indoor air pollutants.

Moisture control is a significant issue in new build, airtight homes. This is further exacerbated through the activity of passively drying clothes indoors, which was reported in the majority of the case study homes. Furthermore, the inadequate use of purge ventilation, particularly after showering/bathing may present significant issues with indoor humidity, including the risk of mould growth. In addition, high humidity levels observed in the bedrooms of the case study dwellings may increase the proliferation of house dust mites, which have been linked to the development of asthma (Korsgaard 1998b). As stated by Korsgaard (1998a, 36), 'present-day building of energy-efficient houses with increased sealing of the building envelope, paralleled by a similar renovation of older houses, has increased indoor air humidity and is probably the cause of the almost fourfold increase in the occurrence of house-dust mites'. Thus sustainable assessment methods should make adequate steps to address this issue, including the consideration of mandatory credits for

strategies such as automatic purge ventilation, dedicated drying spaces or humidity sensors linked to the mechanical ventilation system.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to examine the IAQ of energy efficient dwellings built to the Code for Sustainable Homes and Passivhaus standard. The study found high levels of carbon dioxide in living rooms and main bedrooms of the case study dwellings, significantly high levels of formaldehyde, low relative humidity levels in living rooms and high relative humidity levels in bedrooms. Furthermore, issues with interference with the MVHR system, inadequate use of purge ventilation, lack of knowledge and awareness of the MVHR system, overheating, preference for natural ventilation strategies, high prevalence of air polluting activities, and inadequate perception of IAQ were identified.

The findings are based on relatively limited data from a case study investigation of IAQ in seven homes designed to meet Passivhaus standard and Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 3 and Level 6). For this reason, it is questionable whether the findings from this study can be generalised to the broader UK housing sector based on this study alone, thus further research is required. This case study however provided a unique opportunity to analyse and compare the IAQ of homes designed to a variety of energy efficient design strategies within one single building project.

Although based on a limited sample, this investigation has highlighted a number of issues in homes designed to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes and Passivhaus standard, which should be addressed as a priority in future UK energy efficient housing schemes. A case has been made for the adequate consideration of IAQ in sustainable assessment methods, including the use of mandatory credits to ensure occupant health is not disregarded in the drive towards zero carbon. Future research needs include a large scale investigation on the performance of Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) systems in UK energy efficient homes, including the perception and use of these systems in practice.

References

- Aizlewood, C. and C. Dimitroulopoulou. 2006. "The HOPE Project: The UK Experience." *Indoor and Built Environment* 15 (5): 393-409.
- Arlian, Larry G., Jacqueline S. Neal, and DiAnn L. Vyszynski-Moher. 1999. "Reducing Relative Humidity to Control the House Dust Mite *Dermatophagoides Farinae*." *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* 104 (4): 852-856.
- Arundel, Anthony V., Elia M. Sterling, Judith H. Biggin, and Theodor D. Sterling. 1986. "Indirect Health Effects of Relative Humidity in Indoor Environments." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 65: 351.
- Balvers, J., R. Bogers, R. Jongeneel, I. Van Kamp, A. Boerstra, and F. Van Dijken. 2012. "Mechanical Ventilation in Recently Built Dutch Homes: Technical Shortcomings, Possibilities for Improvement, Perceived Indoor Environment and Health Effects." *Architectural Science Review* 55: 4-14.
- Balvers, J. R., A. C. Boerstra, and F. Van Dijken. 2011. *An Investigation into Re-entrainment of Exhaust Air in Mechanically Ventilated Dwellings*. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Indoor Air Quality and Climate 2011, Austin, USA, 2394-2395
- Berry, R. W., V. M. Brown, S. K. D. Coward, D. R. Crump, M. Gavin, C. P. Grimes, D. F. Higham, et al. 1996. *Indoor Air Quality in Homes: Part 1, the Building Research Establishment Indoor Environment Study*. Bracknell: IHS BRE Press, 1-118.
- Bluyssen, Philomena, Sabine de Richeumont, Derrick Crump, Francois Maupetit, Thomas Witterseh, and Petr Gajdos. 2010. "Actions to Reduce the Impact of Construction Products on Indoor Air: Outcomes of the European Project HealthyAir." *Indoor and Built Environment*. 19 (3): 327-339.
- Bone, A., V. Murray, I. Myers, A. Dengel, and D. Crump. 2010. "Will Drivers for Home Energy Efficiency Harm Occupant Health." *Perspectives in Public Health* 130 (5): 233-238.

- Bornehag, C. G., J. Sundell, L. Hägerhed-Engman, and T. Sigsgaard. 2005. "Association between Ventilation Rates in 390 Swedish Homes and Allergic Symptoms in Children." *Indoor Air* 15 (4): 275-280.
- Burge, PS, AS Robertson, and A. Hedge. 1990. "Validation of Self-Administered Questionnaire in the Diagnosis of Sick Building Syndrome." *Indoor Air* 90 (1): 575-581.
- Burge, S., A. Robertson, and A. Hedge. 1993. "The Development of a Questionnaire Suitable for the Surveillance of Office Buildings to Assess the Building Symptom Index a Measure of the Sick Building Syndrome." *Indoor Air* 93: 731-736.
- Clausen, G., G. Bekö, R. L. Corsi, L. Gunnarsen, W. W. Nazaroff, B. W. Olesen, T. Sigsgaard, J. Sundell, J. Toftum, and C. J. Weschler. 2011. "Reflections on the State of Research: Indoor Environmental Quality." *Indoor Air* 21 (3): 219-230.
- Corsi, R. L. 2011. "Let's Celebrate our Accomplishments and Harness the Power of our Diversity." *Indoor Air* 21 (6): 439-441.
- Crump, D., A. Dengel, and M. Swainson. 2009. *Indoor Air Quality in Highly Energy Efficient Homes- a Review, NF 18*. Vol. NF 18. Watford: IHS BRE press, 1-58.
- Crump, Derrick. 2011. *Climate Change—health Impacts due to Changes in the Indoor Environment; Research Needs: W28*. Cranfield: Institute of Environment and Health. Cranfield University.
- Davies, M. and T. Oreszczyn. 2012. "The Unintended Consequences of Decarbonising the Built Environment: A UK Case Study." *Energy and Buildings* 46 (0): 80-85.
- Davis, Ian and Vicki Harvey. 2008. *Zero Carbon: What does it Mean to Homeowners and Housebuilders (NF9)*. Bucks: NHBC Foundation.
- de Wilde, Pieter and David Coley. 2012. "The Implications of a Changing Climate for Buildings." *Building and Environment* 55 (0): 1-7.

- Department of Communities and Local Government. 2006. *Code for Sustainable Homes: A Step Change in Sustainable Home Building Practice*. London: Communities and Local Government Publications.
- Department of Communities and Local Government. 2008a. *The Code for Sustainable Homes: Setting the Standard in Sustainability for New Homes*. London: Communities and Local Government Publications.
- Department of Communities and Local Government. 2008b. *Performance Testing of Buildings: BD 2535*. London: Communities and Local Government.
- Dimitroulopoulou, C. 2012. "Ventilation in European Dwellings: A Review." *Building and Environment* 47: 109-125.
- Dols, W. S., A. K. Persilly, and S. J. Nabinger. 1996. "Indoor Air Quality in Green Buildings: A Review and Case Study, Proceedings of IAQ '96 Conference." Baltimore, October 6-8.
- Eick, Susan Ann and George Richardson. 2011. "Investigation of Different Approaches to Reduce Allergens in Asthmatic Children's Homes — the Breath of Fresh Air Project, Cornwall, United Kingdom." *Science of the Total Environment* 409 (19): 3628-3633.
- Environmental Protection Agency. 2011. *Healthy Indoor Environment Protocols for Home Energy Upgrades: Guidance for Achieving Safe and Healthy Indoor Environments during Home Energy Retrofits*. U.S.A: EPA Office of Air and Radiation.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). 1991. *Building Air Quality - A Guide for Building Owners and Facility Managers*. Washington, DC: DHHS (NIOSH), 91-114.
- German Working Group on Indoor Guideline Values of the Federal Environmental Agency and the State's Health Authority. 2008. *Health Evaluation of Carbon Dioxide in Indoor Air / Gesundheitliche Bewertung Von Kohlendioxid in Der Innenraumluft*. Vol. 51.
- Gill, Z. M., M. J. Tierney, I. M. Pegg, and N. Allan. "Low-Energy Dwellings: The Contribution of Behaviours to Actual Performance." *Building Research and Information* 38: 491-508.

- Godish, Thad. 1996. "Impact of Residential Infiltration-Reducing Energy Conservation Measures on Indoor Air Quality and Potential Health Effects." *Environmental Reviews* 4 (2): 91-99.
- Hill, Duncan. 1999. *Field Study of Heat Recovery Ventilation Systems*. Canada: Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- HM Government. 2008. *Climate Change Act, Chapter 27*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Innovation & Growth Team. 2010. *Low Carbon Construction: Final Report*. London: HM Gov.
- Knudsen, Henrik N., Ole M. Jensen, and Lars Kristensen. 2012. *Occupant Satisfaction with New Low-Energy Houses*. Proceedings of Healthy Buildings, Brisbane, Australia.
- Korsgaard, J. 1998a. "Epidemiology of House-dust Mites." *Allergy* 53 (s48): 36-40.
- Korsgaard, J. 1998b. "House-dust Mites and Asthma. A Review on House-dust Mites as a Domestic Risk Factor for Mite Asthma." *Allergy* 53 (s48): 77-83.
- Lee, S., G. Kwon, J. Joo, J. T. Kim, and S. Kim. 2012. "A Finish Material Management System for Indoor Air Quality of Apartment Buildings (FinIAQ)." *Energy and Buildings* 46: 68-79.
- Leech, JA, M. Raizenne, and J. Gusdorf. 2004. "Health in Occupants of Energy Efficient New Homes." *Indoor Air* 14 (3): 169-173.
- Letz, Gideon A. 1990. "Sick Building Syndrome: Acute Illness among Office Workers: The Role of Building Ventilation, Airborne Contaminants and Work Stress." *Allergy Proceedings* 11 (3): 109-116.
- Levin, Hal. 1995. *Building Ecology: An Architect's Perspective on Healthy Buildings*. Proceedings of Healthy Buildings Conference' 95, Milan, Italy, Sept 10-15
- Levin, H. 2005. *Integrating Indoor Air and Design for Sustainability*. Proceedings of Indoor Air 2005, Beijing, China, September 4-9

- Lowe, RJ and D. Johnston. 1997. *Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery in Local Authority, Low-Rise Housing: Final Report on the Derwentside Field Trial*. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University.
- Lyles, W. Bradford, Kevin W. Greve, Russell M. Bauer, Michael R. Ware, Carol J. Schramke, John Crouch, and Andrew Hicks. 1991. "Sick Building Syndrome." *Southern Medical Journal* 84 (1): 65-71.
- Majumdar, Mili. 2001. *Energy-Efficient Buildings in India*. New Delhi: TERI Press.
- Mardiana-Idayu, A. and S. B. Riffat. 2012. "Review on Heat Recovery Technologies for Building Applications." *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 16 (2): 1241-1255.
- Marsh, Rob and Michael Luring. 2011. "Architecture and Energy: Questioning Regulative and Architectural Paradigms for Danish Low-Energy Housing." *ARQ: Architectural Research Quarterly* 15 (2): 165-175.
- Mendell, M. J. and L. Fine. 1994. "Building Ventilation and Symptoms--Where do we Go from here?" *American Journal of Public Health* 84 (3): 346-348.
- Mlecnik, E., T. Schütze, SJT Jansen, G. de Vries, HJ Visscher, and A. van Hal. 2012. "End-User Experiences in nearly Zero-Energy Houses." *Energy and Buildings* 49: 471-478.
- Mudarri, David H. 2010. *Building Codes and Indoor Air Quality*. Arlington, VA: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Nabinger, Steven and Andrew Persily. 2011. "Impacts of Airtightening Retrofits on Ventilation Rates and Energy Consumption in a Manufactured Home." *Energy and Buildings* 43 (11): 3059-3067.
- NHBC. 2009. "Standards Extra 44, NHBC's Technical Newsletter, April 2009, NHBC (National House Building Council), HB2503 04/09." *NHBC's Technical Newsletter*, 1-12.
- Offermann, Francis J. 2010. "IAQ Applications IAQ in Airtight Homes." *ASHRAE Journal* 52 (11): 58.

- Offermann, Francis J. 2009. *Ventilation and Indoor Air Quality in New Homes. PIER Collaborative Report*. California: California Energy Commission & California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board.
- Persily, A. K. and S. J. Emmerich. 2010. *Indoor Air Quality in Sustainable, Energy Efficient Buildings, Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Indoor Air Quality, Ventilation and Energy Conservation (IAQVEC)*. Syracuse, New York, August 15-18.
- Raw, Gary J., Michael S. Roys, Carolyn Whitehead, and David Tong. 1996. "Questionnaire Design for Sick Building Syndrome: An Empirical Comparison of Options." *Environment International* 22 (1): 61-72.
- Raw, GJ, C. Whitehead, A. Robertson, S. Burge, C. Kely, and P. Leinster. 1995. *A Questionnaire for Studies of Sick Building Syndrome: A Report to the Royal Society of Health Advisory Group on Sick Building Syndrome*. Watford: Building Research Establishment.
- Richardson, George and Susan Ann Eick. 2006. "The Paradox of an Energy-Efficient Home: Is it Good Or Bad for Health?" *Community Practitioner* 79 (12): 397-399.
- Ridley, I., S. Pretlove, M. Ucci, D. Momovic, M. Davies, and T. Oreszczyn. 2006. *Asthma/Dust Mite Study- Final Report: Sensitivity of Humidity and Mould Growth to Occupier Behaviour in Dwellings Designed to the New Air Tightness Requirements, Technical Report*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Ridley, I., J. Fox, T. Oreszczyn, and SH Hong. 2003. "The Impact of Replacement Windows on Air Infiltration and Indoor Air Quality in Dwellings." *International Journal of Ventilation* 1 (3): 209-218.
- Schenck, Paula, A. Karim Ahmed, Anne Bracker, and CIH Robert DeBernardo. 2010. *Climate Change, Indoor Air Quality and Health*. Connecticut: University of Connecticut Health Center.

- Schnieders, Jürgen and Andreas Hermelink. 2006. "CEPHEUS Results: Measurements and Occupants' Satisfaction Provide Evidence for Passive Houses being an Option for Sustainable Building." *Energy Policy* 34 (2): 151-171.
- Smith, Peter F. 2005. *Architecture in a Climate of Change: A Guide to Sustainable Design*. Oxford: Architectural Press.
- Spengler, John D. and Qingyan Chen. 2000. "Indoor Air Quality Factors in Designing a Healthy Building." *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment* 25 (1): 567-600.
- Sullivan, L., N. Smith, D. Adams, I. Andrews, W. Aston, K. Bromley, K. Butler, et al. 2013. *Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery in New Homes*. London: NHBC, Zero Carbon Hub.
- Sullivan, L., N. Smith, D. Adams, I. Andrews, W. Aston, K. Bromley, K. Butler, et al. 2012. *Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery in New Homes*. Milton Keynes: Zero Carbon Hub and NHBC.
- Sundell, J., H. Levin, W. W. Nazaroff, W. S. Cain, W. J. Fisk, D. T. Grimsrud, F. Gyntelberg, et al. 2011. "Ventilation Rates and Health: Multidisciplinary Review of the Scientific Literature." *Indoor Air* 21 (3): 191-204.
- Taylor, M. and L. Morgan. 2011. *Ventilation and Good Indoor Air Quality in Low Energy Homes: Finding Proven Good Practice*. London: Good Homes Alliance.
- Turner, W. J. N., J. M. Logue, and C. P. Wray. 2013. "A Combined Energy and IAQ Assessment of the Potential Value of Commissioning Residential Mechanical Ventilation Systems." *Building and Environment* 60: 194-201.
- Ucci, M., I. Ridley, S. Pretlove, D. Mumovic, M. Davies, O. Oreszczyn, M. McCarthy, and J. Singh. 2004. *Ventilation Rates and Moisture-Related Allergens in UK Dwellings*. Proceedings of 2nd WHO International Housing and Health Symposium, Lithuania, 328 - 334
- van der Pluijm, WMP Jeffry. 2010. *The Robustness and Effectiveness of Mechanical Ventilation in Airtight Dwellings: A Study to the Residential Application of Mechanical*

Ventilation with Heat Recovery in the Netherlands. Eindhoven: Eindhoven University of Technology.

Viktor Dorer and Dieter Breer. 1998. "Residential Mechanical Ventilation Systems: Performance Criteria and Evaluations." *Energy and Buildings* 27 (3): 247-255.

Ward, Ian C. 2008. "The Potential Impact of the New (UK) Building Regulations on the Provision of Natural Ventilation in Dwellings - A Case Study of Low Energy Social Housing." *International Journal of Ventilation* 7 (1): 77-88.

Wasley, James. 2000. "Safe Houses and Green Architecture: Reflections on the Lessons of the Chemically Sensitive." *Journal of Architectural Education (1984-)* 53 (4): 207-215.

Wolkoff, P., Jacob Klenø Nøjgaard, P. Troiano, and B. Piccoli. 2005. "Eye Complaints in the Office Environment: Precorneal Tear Film Integrity Influenced by Eye Blinking Efficiency." *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 62 (1): 4-12.

Wolkoff, Peder and Søren K. Kjærgaard. 2007. "The Dichotomy of Relative Humidity on Indoor Air Quality." *Environment International* 33 (6): 850-857.

World Health Organization. 2000. *Air Quality Guidelines for Europe*. WHO Regional Publications. 2nd ed. Vol. 91. Copenhagen: Regional Office for Europe, WHO.

Y.P. Zhou, J.Y. Wu, and R.Z. Wang. 2007. "Performance of Energy Recovery Ventilator with various Weathers and Temperature Set-Points." *Energy and Buildings* 39 (12): 1202-1210.

Yu, Chuck and Derrick Crump. 2010. "Indoor Environmental Quality - Standards for Protection of Occupants' Safety, Health and Environment." *Indoor and Built Environment*. 19: 499-502.

Yu, C. W. F. and J. T. Kim. 2012. "Low-Carbon Housings and Indoor Air Quality." *Indoor and Built Environment* 21: 5-15.